

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of December 6, 2007 all claims are rejected. Prosecution has been reopened after the decision on Appeal of November 20, 2007 reversing the Examiner. With this response claim 1 is amended. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found at least from Figures 3(b) and 4, as well as page 11, line 15—page 12, line 14 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 5, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Song et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,918) in view of Takizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,074). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the terminal forming area is located between the display area and the side where the TFT array substrate is cut off during fabrication of the liquid crystal display. Claim 1 is further amended to recite that the first metallic line and the second metallic line are made from different metallic layers in a first side of the terminal forming area facing the display area and in a second side of the terminal forming area facing the side where the TFT array substrate is cut off during fabrication. Therefore, claim 1 is amended to clarify the location of the display area, and the composition of the first and second metallic line which are arranged beneath a terminal electrode at the terminal forming area.

In contrast to claim 1, Song shows in Figure 12 a pixel electrode (40) and not a terminal electrode. As the amendments to claim 1 make clear, the location of the pixel electrode (40) and the terminal electrode recited in claim 1 are entirely different, and therefore the pixel electrode is not the equivalent of the terminal electrode in claim 1. Song discloses a gate pad (24a) and a pad electrode (34c) with an insulating layer (28) in between. See Song Figure 12. However, Song fails to disclose that either the gate pad (24a) or the pad electrode (34c) face either the display area or the side where the TFT array substrate is cut off during fabrication, because the gate pad

(24a) and pad electrode (34c) are beneath the pixel electrode (40), which is in the display area (referred to as pad region D in Song).

Claim 1 clearly recites that the display area is provide with a pixel electrode, and the terminal forming area is provided with a terminal electrode. Therefore, the pixel electrode and the terminal electrode are distinct components in claim 1. As such, the cited references must disclose all of the limitations of each component in order to render claim 1 unpatentable. Even if Song teaches a pixel electrode of similar construction as the terminal electrode recited in claim 1, Song fails to disclose or suggest that the pixel electrode is located in a terminal forming area located between a display area and the side where the TFT array substrate is cut off during fabrication of the liquid crystal display. Takizawa does not disclose or suggest providing a pixel electrode of the composition as the pixel electrode in Song in a terminal forming area, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Takizawa fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Song. As such, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, since the pixel electrode in Song is located at a different location than the terminal electrode in claim 1, the pixel electrode is not cut off during fabrication of the liquid crystal display. Therefore, the pixel electrode is not capable of minimizing exfoliation of the second metallic line and short circuits resulting from such exfoliation, because the pixel electrode is not located in a region that is cut off during fabrication. The structure recited in claim 1 at the particular locations recited in claim 1 is a non-obvious difference from the cited references, because the occurrence of the peeled metal pieces is minimized, and peeling of the supplementary line as well as generation of peeled metal pieces is decreased so that occurrence of short circuits between terminals is decreased. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The claims depending from claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Date: 6 Mar 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955